

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the application.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §112 as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to address the alleged problem.

Claims 22-27 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. Re. 37,590, to Leyden et al (Leyden). Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Leyden in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,467,075 (Rand). Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Leyden in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,659,382 (Ryczek). Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Leyden in view of Ryczek and Rand.

Claim 21 does not stand rejected on any art. Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form and is believed allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-20, and 22-29 is requested.

Claim 22 is directed to a security system with a flexible cord, housing, and support, that are interconnected so that the cord can be turned about its length continuously in one direction without causing kinking of the cord.

Leyden teaches what is acknowledged to be prior art on page 2 of applicant's specification. However, Leyden does not teach or suggest any structure to prevent cord twisting in the event that the connector thereon is joined to an article that is turned about the length of the cord. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has misinterpreted the twisting problem. The problem is not preventing the withdrawn cord in Leyden from dangling, but rather avoiding twisting resulting from turning of the cord about the length thereof.

Claims 23-27 depend cognately from claim 22 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over Leyden.

The Examiner relies on Rand in combination with Leyden in rejecting claims 28 and 29. Rand is relied upon by the Examiner for the disclosure therein of a "roller component". However, the roller component in Rand is used to trigger a switch, as described with respect to Fig. 4. There is no teaching or suggestion of how a bearing such as Rand's might be incorporated into Leyden's structure to arrive at the structure in claims 28 and 29.

The Examiner relies on Ryczek in combination with Leyden in rejecting claims 1-15. Ryczek is essentially cumulative to Leyden. The Examiner has referred to language in Ryczek in column 2, lines 14-34. What is referred to in this paragraph is not that the cord is twisted, but rather that the spool is turned through rotation. The disclosure in Ryczek is not directed to any structure for avoiding twisting of a cord about its length.

Claims 15-20 include a bearing assembly. As noted above, Rand does not teach or suggest any type of bearing assembly that might be utilized to avoid twisting of the cord about its length.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-20, and 22-29, and allowance of the case are requested.

Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Dec 7, 2004